DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 533 EA 014 082

AUTHOR DeGeorge, George P., Ed.
TITLE Improving Bilingual Program Management. A Handbook for Title VII Directors.
INSTITUTION National Assessment and Dissemination Center for Bilingual Education, Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Curriculum Development; Educational Diagnosis; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership; Parent Participation; *Program Administration; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Program Proposals; Proposal Writing; Public Relations
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII

ABSTRACT

Filled with practical advice and workable techniques and strategies to help bilingual program directors deal with the problems they face, this handbook brings together ideas and suggestions from Title VII program directors, state coordinators, and superintendents with experience in bilingual programs. The handbook, written in question and answer format, is a distillation of the contributions of presenters and participants at the 1979-80 Institutes for Program Improvement. The first chapter on program evaluation looks at such things as types of evaluation and problems of testing. The section on leadership development highlights both situational leadership and how to deal with school district personnel and administrators and the community. Proposal writing is also covered, or more specifically, assessing the needs of bilingual populations, formulating a program, and translating that program into a fundable proposal. One chapter deals with strategies for parental involvement, and another deals with strategies for involving bilingual and monolingual students in joint activities. Ways to formulate a parallel curriculum and some problems related to diagnostic and placement testing are also touched on. (JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208533

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Improving Bilingual Program Management

A Handbook for Title VII Directors

George P. DeGeorge, Editor

EA 014 042

Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Published by Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, ESEA Title VII Lesley College, 49 Washington Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 02140.

Second printing pilot test version published February 1981.

First printing by Institutes for Program Improvement, Lesley College, Cambridge, Massachusetts September 1980.

The activity which is the subject of this publication was supported in whole or part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

The Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education is a special ESEA, Title VII project funded by the U.S. Department of Education through Lesley College, Cambridge, Mass. and the Fall River Public School System.

The publication was developed and printed with funds provided by Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Preface

The improved management of bilingual programs, particularly Title VII programs, is the primary purpose for this handbook. The same reason led to the creation of the Institutes for Program Improvement of which this handbook is the product. The Institutes identified strategies which bilingual program directors can use to deal with the diverse range of problems they encounter. This handbook is a compilation and summary of those strategies.

The Institutes for Program Improvement, which operated during FY 1979-80, were a joint effort of the National Assessment and Dissemination Center and the Lesley Collaborative for Educational Development, both at Lesley College in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Institute participants included Title VII directors, state coordinators, and applicants from New England. The third Institute, held in May 1980 was held in collaboration with the Administrators' Management Institute in Bilingual Education directed by Dr. Maria Estela Brisk of Boston University. Superintendents whose school districts have a Title VII program were the target population of the Administrators' Institute.

The topics covered at the Institutes for Program Improvement and summarized in this handbook were based on a carefully identified set of training needs. The 1978 Report of the National Survey of Title VII, the evaluation reports of the Annual Title VII Bilingual Education Management Institute, and several surveys of Title VII state coordinators and program directors in New England were the principal means whereby those needs were assessed. Time after time it was stressed that Title VII program directors needed practical advice and workable techniques and strategies to deal with the problems and situations they encounter. The Institutes and this handbook are a response to these needs.

The chapters in this handbook are based upon the notes taken by recorders during the presentations as well as upon the hand-outs distributed by presenters. The text incorporates the contributions of both presenters and participants and was written by the editor.

I hope that this handbook will provide useful information and ideas for all bilingual program directors, as well as insight into the problems they are faced with. Most importantly, I hope that this manual, through fostering better program management, will have a positive impact on the education and development of bilingual students. It is to meet their needs that bilingual programs exist and that bilingual educators work.

G.P. De George

National Assessment and
Dissemination Center
Lesley College
September, 1980

Acknowledgements

The writing of this handbook is the result of many contributions. My thanks to Dr. Pasquale J. De Vito of R.I. Department of Education (Program Evaluation), Alan Hurwitz of Fitchburg State Bilingual Vocational Teacher Training Program (Leadership Styles — A Situational Approach), John Corcoran of Worcester Public Schools (Working within a System), John Stefani and John Marvelle (Proposal Writing), Raffael De Gruttola of Boston Public Schools (Parent Involvement) and Carmen Pola of the Boston Public Schools' Bilingual Master PAC (Parent Involvement) for the excellent presentations they conducted. My thanks also to Manuel Monteiro of Boston Public Schools, Elizabeth Johnson of Fitchburg Public Schools and Dr. Patricia Arrendondo-Dowd of Boston University who conducted discussion groups at the third Institute. I would also like to thank Dr. Maria E. Brisk of Boston University and Lucia David of the University of Massachusetts, Boston, for their collaboration.

Special thanks go to Ernest J. Mazzone, Director of Transitional Bilingual Education and Eduardo Carballo, Title VII Coordinator, both of Massachusetts; to Angie Soler, Title VII Coordinator in Connecticut; Virginia daMota, Bilingual Consultant in Rhode Island; Sr. Cecile Brussand, Title VII Coordinator in Vermont; Robert Fournier, Consultant for Foreign Language Education in New Hampshire and Bernard Berube, Title VII Coordinator in Maine for their valuable assistance.

My appreciation also goes to John R. Correiro and Dr. Charles McMillan, the program managers, for their constant support, help and advice throughout my coordinatorship of the Institutes and to Gayle Anderson for providing excellent secretarial backup and typewritten manuscripts.

G. P. DG

Contents

		Page
Program Evaluation		1
Leadership Development:	Leadership Styles — A Situational Approach	13
Leadership Development:	Working within a System	19
Proposal Writing		25
Parental Involvement		37
Strategies for Involving Bilingual and Monolingual Students in Joint Activities		43
Curricular Strategies		45
Assessment		47

Program Evaluation

Dealing with one's evaluator and evaluation designs were two main concerns identified by Institute participants in the area of program evaluation. Also of major interest were the uses of evaluation for program management and improvement. Other questions were rather specific, such as how one writes objectives and what are the dangers of evaluation. The following text will present the questions raised and the strategies and information given in response.

What is evaluation?

Evaluation is the process of determining the value or effectiveness of an activity for the purpose of decision-making. By value is meant the worthwhileness of the activity and by effectiveness its overall impact. Decision-making involves making changes in the program to improve effectiveness or program operation.

Why do people evaluate programs and what are some of the uses of evaluation results?

The following reasons were discussed:

- because it is a federal requirement
- to obtain school committee support for the program
- to assess needs
- to determine whether assessed needs have been addressed or resolved
- to determine goals and objectives
- to ascertain whether objectives have been met
- to formulate program activities and deal with objectives
- to check whether program activities are working
- to improve the project

- to determine the overall effect or impact of the program
- to validate the program and to obtain refunding or renewal

What are the different types of evaluation?

There are two types of evaluation: formative and summative.

Formative or process evaluation takes place in the course of program operation. It is used to make changes and adjustments in mid-course. The criterion for such changes is whether or not program activities (i.e., processes) are achieving objectives.

Summative or product evaluation occurs at the termination of the project. Such evaluation judges whether a program has been successful in achieving overall objectives and in meeting student needs. Where a program operates for a period of two years or more, the summative evaluation for one year's operation may function as the formative evaluation for the next.

What constitutes a sound evaluation design?

In the last analysis, one must choose a workable evaluation design for a specific program in a particular setting. Of the available evaluation designs, one must choose the most "stringent" design allowable in one's situation. A "stringent" design will aid in validating a program, i.e., show that the progress of students in one's program can be attributed to the program and not to extraneous factors. Program validation is crucial for federally funded bilingual programs.

A "stringent" evaluation design usually incorporates three features:

- control groups against which to measure the performance of program students
- random assignment of students to program and control groups, thus giving each potential student an equal chance of being in either the program or control group
- reasonable control over the program (or treatment) being implemented

The above criteria are usually found in experimental designs. An example of such a design is the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. In this design:

- students are randomly assigned to either the experimental (program) group or the control (non-program) group — this assures that the control group will resemble the experimental group at pre-test time
- both groups are pretested at the same time with the same test
- the experimental group receives instruction in the program (here, the bilingual program) while the control group does not
- then both groups are posttested
- "t" tests are performed on the results of each group to show whether growth is significant
- the members of each group must be the same for both pre- and posttesting

The possibility of using the Pretest-Posttest Design for bilingual programs is remote at this time.

What, therefore, are some alternative evaluation designs that can possibly be used for bilingual programs?

A design which approximates the above and which is sometimes possible with bilingual programs is the Nonequivalent Control Group Design. This design resembles the Pretest-Posttest Design except that the members of the groups are not selected randomly. Rather, the groups are taken intact as they exist in their instructional setting. Also, the non-program group is referred to as the comparison group rather than the control group.

The chief defect of this model is that, because random selection does not take place, the groups may not be essentially similar at the time of pretesting. One way of attempting to ensure similarity is to randomly assign whole classrooms or groups of students to either the experimental or comparison categories. If such random group selection is not possible, then similar schools or groups of students could be used as the comparison group.

In using the Nonequivalent Control Group Design, one must be able to make a case for the similarity of the two groups. Even if pretest results for both groups are similar, it will be necessary to show that it is reasonable to compare the achievement gains for both groups after program treatment has taken place.

A second alternative not as "stringent" as the above is the Norm-Referenced Model. In this design, the performance or "gains" of the program or experimental group is compared to the performance of the norming sample, i.e., the group from whose performance the test norms were derived. In the Norm-Referenced Model, therefore, the norming sample is used as a sort of comparison group against which to compare the growth or gains of the program group. National norms are usually used for this purpose; however, if appropriate state or local norms are available, these may also be used.

One way of using the test data in this design is to determine the expected performance level of one's students. Let us say that at the end of a particular program, one's students are expected to score at the 35th percentile. However, at posttesting time, one's students may score at the 43rd percentile. In this case, there is an advantageous difference between what one expects and what one obtains. Such a difference would constitute evidence of program effectiveness.

Several precautions must be observed in using this design. The norms to be used must be well constructed and developed, include students like those in the project, and have norm tables that allow conversions to standard scores. In other words, one must find a norming sample which is comparable or similar to one's program students. Another precaution is that pretests and posttests be administered to the program group at the same time of year that test makers tested the norming sample, or at least within two to three weeks of those dates. If these concerns are taken into account, the comparisons between the program group and the norming sample will appear reasonable to a validation panel.

A third design alternative is a Time Series Design. A Time Series Design commonly involves only a single group of students. Further, a series of measurements, perhaps three, are taken on certain skills or attributes prior to experimental program treatment (in this context, the bilingual program). After treatment, another set of measurements is taken. The question is whether the experimental program treatment has had any effect

on the performance of the group. The problem with a Time Series Design is always whether factors other than the program treatment can explain positive effects on student performance as shown in test performance. While there are many other complex problems that arise with a Time Series Design, the underlying assumption is that if a study based on such a design shows steady, slow growth, then something good is happening as a result of programmatic treatment. One way of stengthening the design is to add a control group which would likewise receive a series of measurements but not the programmatic treatment.

A Time Series Design may be helpful in projects where classical testing is inappropriate. For instance, projects that gauge success by decreasing the number of disruptive behaviors, decreasing absentee rates, or increasing number and degree of social interactions may find a Time Series Design to be of particular benefit.

A fourth alternative evaluation design involves the use of Criterion Comparisons. In this form of evaluation, a criterion of mastery (such as is seen in behavioral objectives) is established. The program students are then tested to see whether their performance meets the mastery standard. In this design, however, the appropriateness of the mastery criterion could be questioned as being too low or too high. Further, it could be argued that the standard or criterion was set arbitrarily. In cases of project validation, such objections would have to be dealt with convincingly.

A fifth alternative is the Case Study Approach, which is best suited to a small number of students. Consequently, this design is often used with projects in special areas or with intensive services for small numbers of participants. Efforts to validate programs evaluated through case studies are subject to questions, however. One must make the case that the measurements taken were appropriate and that the results taken on a small number of cases are generalizable to other groups and settings.

The sixth and last evaluation design to be discussed here is the One Group Pretest-Posttest Design. In this design, only the program group receives the program treatment and testing. This is an extremely weak design that is commonly employed. Whether or not measured gains are attributable to the program are always open to question.

As stated at the beginning, one must choose a workable evaluation design for a specific program in a particular setting. The design selected should be that which is the most "stringent" yet workable.

What are some of the problems associated with evaluation designs?

The greatest problem with evaluation designs, which are really types of experimental or research designs, are factors which may influence results other than the treatment or program. Some of these have already been mentioned above.

To give an example, if the evaluation of a bilingual program reports significant cognitive and affective gains for program students, one may ask whether those gains are attributable to the bilingual program or whether outside influences had a hand in bringing them about, or whether the gains would have occurred even without the bilingual program. If, as the preceding discussion maintains, one employs a "stringent" evaluation design that rules out or "controls" such extraneous factors, then the question need not arise. Where a weaker design is used, the question will always arise and one must deal with it as rationally as possible.

These extraneous factors are called threats to the internal validity of the evaluation design and are of the following general types: historical events; student maturation; the use of unreliable tests or observers; a high number of students who leave the program before completion; regression toward the mean resulting in gains which appear confounded or larger than they really are; and using comparison groups that may be incomparable to the project group.

A "stringent" evaluation design incorporates the features that eliminate threats: control or comparison groups, random assignment of students to program and non-program (control) groups as well as reasonable control over the project being implemented. In the case of bilingual programs, however, linguistic need is the major factor determining student entrance. Since all students having linguistic need must be admitted to the program, random assignment is not possible.

A threat to internal validity that needs some explaining is regression toward the mean. This phenomenon occurs when the scores of students on a pretest are used as a criterion for entrance into the program. If only the lowest scoring students are to be selected, then their pretest scores usually represent their poorest performance, since they score low because they are poor achievers and/or they are poor guessers (on true-false and multiple-choice items). If given the same test a week or two later, the chances are that the same students will score higher. Therefore, if the initial entrance test is also counted

as a pretest in a pretest-posttest evaluation design for the program, the gains will most likely appear greater than they are.

The same phenomenon will be true of high scorers on an entrance test. On subsequent measurements, their scores will tend to regress toward the common mean, in other words, they will tend to score lower. This phenomenon is also called the regression effect. Care must be taken not to interpret regression toward the mean as an effect of the program.

What problems arise as a result of testing in bilingual program evaluation?

Testing is a major problem in bilingual education. There is a serious lack of sound testing instruments and more often than not one must settle for "the best of the worst."

One approach to this problem is the use of criterion-referenced tests, if they are available and they match one's objectives. Available norm-referenced tests usually do not correspond well to bilingual program objectives.

If one decides to write one's own criterion-referenced tests, a second problem arises: observers will have to be convinced that the program is making a difference. Observers are apt to conclude that the tests were written in such a way as to guarantee successful results.

What kind of reliability and validity should be sought in testing instruments?

Where test manuals present reliability coefficients, those coefficients should fall between .75 and .90. By reliability here is meant consistency of measurement.

Validity, on the other hand, is the extent to which a test measures what is is supposed to measure. Validity coefficients appearing in manuals should fall at least between .60 and .75.

One should consider what the test is measuring as well as for whom. A test may be obstensibly valid and reliable, yet inappropriate for one's bilingual program students.

How does one evaluate a curriculum in which two cultures are involved?

One method of beginning to handle this problem is to bring the two cultures into a subject area, such as history, and to stress common characteristics.

To evaluate such a curriculum, one can identify experts in the various subjects which comprise the curriculum and have them review curricular objectives. In addition, the curriculum should be fieldtested using student as well as teacher feedback.

How does one conduct an in-house evaluation?

One does so essentially in the same manner as an outside evaluator. The various tasks and functions connected with the evaluation are simply assigned to appropriate program personnel.

How does one make evaluation reports easy for everyone to understand?

One removes all the technical language so that the layman can read it.

How does one deal and communicate with one's outside evaluator?

To insure that communication lines are always open, the project director should play an integral part in the evaluation process. Further, the overall evaluation plan should provide a reporting schedule and feedback on the project impact. Such reporting requirements will tend to upgrade program evaluations. Further, uniform reporting will allow the SEA to cull evaluations from the various bilingual programs in its jurisdiction to determine the statewide impact of bilingual education.

What kinds of contract specifications should one insist upon with one's evaluator?

One's contract should include the following provisions:

- a schedule of products, e.g., materials, instruments, reports
- a schedule of services, e.g., visitation dates and agenda, director-evaluator meetings to discuss problems as they arise, initial meeting to present the evaluation to staff
- a reporting schedule specifying who (director, evaluator) should report what, when and to whom
- a schedule of payments specifying how much is to be paid to whom and for what (if tests are needed, try obtaining them first through a search rather than contracting to have them written)
- a clear statement of reports to be written (at least two should be written — an interim and a final report)
- that all project objectives be evaluated
- that the evaluator make an oral presentation of evaluation results to the staff
- that the evaluator be available for short-term follow-up to clear up any discrepancies in the final report
- that the evaluator be chosen by a competitive bid contract

What should the interim report consist of?

The interim (or implementation) report should include the following items:

- a brief program description including goals and activities
- evaluation strategies, e.g., tests, interviews, questionnaires
- an accounting of the previous year's recommendations, i.e., reasons why specific recommendations were or were not implemented
- the results of process monitoring to date, i.e., program start-up operations, staff assignments, parental involvement, project participants

- general conclusions and recommendations

The interim report constitutes a major role in formative evaluation and is intended to inform project personnel how the project is doing.

What should the final report consist of?

The final report should contain the following items:

- an executive summary giving a brief description of project intent and population, the major points of the larger report and the major successes, problems, conclusions and recommendations (the executive summary is for administrators and others who want to read the report but would be unwilling to spend large amounts of time reading a lengthy, technical document)
- a project description containing information on the major intent, the number of students served by grade level, the number of staff funded, the total budget for the year, the language group served, and the major activities which occurred
- a comparison of the TBE and Title VII programs
- a list of the objectives and the methods and instruments used to assess them
- a discussion of the statistical significance of results, of whether objectives were met, and some of the qualifications to be observed in interpreting the report
- a description of unanticipated outcomes
- an account of overall project effectiveness including conclusions and recommendations

What are some of the dangers or pitfalls of evaluation?

Among the drawbacks of evaluation were mentioned the likelihood that:

- the project may not "look good"
- the project "looks good" on paper but in reality does not
- evaluation firms, in an effort to obtain a subsequent contract, tend not to be critical
- the least qualified bidder may obtain the contract

How may one avoid the dangers and pitfalls of evaluation?

One may avoid them by:

- insuring that the evaluators are as objective as possible
- seeing that even a good evaluation contains recommendations for the future (it is to be borne in mind that a purpose of evaluation is to offer justification for refunding and to demonstrate the worthwhileness of the program, especially to the school committee)
- having the director know beforehand what the major recommendations are, prior to the write-up of the final report, and not having the director change the report so much as to insure that the supporting data is correct
- basing decisions on true evaluation data and not on "how the project looks"

Leadership Development: Leadership Styles — A Situational Approach

Which leadership styles are most appropriate and effective in managing a bilingual program staff was one of the principal needs voiced by Institute participants in the area of program management. Interpersonal relationships, involving staff in decision-making, and delegating responsibility were other needs identified.

To deal with these concerns, the presenter began by inquiring into the nature of leadership, discussed the Hersey-Blanchard Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, led the participants through a series of exercises which gave them insight into the theory, assisted them in discovering their own leadership style, and provided opportunities to apply the theory.

The insights and strategies derived from the presentation are summarized in the following series of questions and answers.

What is a leader?

Anyone who accomplishes tasks through the work of others.

What is meant by leadership?

Leadership is the process of influencing others, i.e., one's subordinates, to accomplish goals.

What is leadership style?

Leadership style is the way a leader deals with situations in which people are to be influenced to accomplish goals.

Leadership style is also a consistent pattern of behavior as perceived by subordinates.

Is an administrator's leadership style fixed or does it vary?

In general, an administrator's leadership style should vary according to the demands of the various situations in which it is to be applied. An administrator's preferences or inclinations, therefore, should not be the only factors which determine leadership style.

What is the goal of leadership?

- success in the achievement of stated goals and objectives
- success in creating a positive work climate, i.e., an atmosphere in which people feel good about what is happening — this is especially important in the field of education

What does leadership behavior consist of?

- performing tasks, giving instructions and providing a structure
- building relationships, being sensitive to and listening to the feelings of one's staff

What, then, is the Hersey-Blanchard Life Cycle Theory of Leadership?

The Hersey-Blanchard Theory views leadership style as a composite of high and low degrees of an administrator's relationships behavior and task behavior. Relationships behavior refers to interactions of a personal or social nature initiated by an administrator toward a subordinate, e.g., showing concern for how a subordinate feels about something. Task behavior refers to job-related, managerial interactions, e.g., reminding a subordinate that a specific task must be completed as scheduled. When the degrees of relationships behavior and task behavior are projected onto a matrix, leadership styles fall into four basic quadrants or categories. They are as follows:

- High task and low relationships behavior. Administrators in this category give much direction but show little concern for the feelings and thoughts of subordinates. Drill sargeants often exhibit these types of behaviors.

- High task and high relationships behavior. Much direction with much caring about what subordinates think and feel characterizes this learning style. Workshop leaders often operate in this manner.

- Low task and high relationships behavior. Little direction but a high degree of personal interaction with subordinates are the principal behaviors exhibited by administrators having this style. A frequent example is that of the administrator who gives much moral support but little direction to an expert teacher.

- Low task and low relationships behavior. Administrators having this style give little direction and are fairly uninvolved with staff. A director of a research lab who has little contact with subordinates who are very much on their own is an example of such an administrator.

How, then, does an administrator choose an appropriate leadership style?

Basic to the Hersey-Blanchard theory is the notion, already mentioned, that an administrator's leadership style is not necessarily fixed or determined by his or her own preference or inclination. According to the theory, therefore, the ability to alter one's leadership style according to the demands of a situation, i.e., flexibility in leadership style, is considered a mark of good leadership. Judgements of which style to adopt are based upon the administrator's analysis of the task relevant maturity of subordinates. By task relevant maturity is meant a subordinate's ability to set high but attainable goals, willingness and ability to assume the responsibility of performing the specific tasks leading to goal accomplishment, and the necessary training and experience to do so.

In a sense, then, one aim of leadership is to bring subordinates to a high degree of task relevant maturity. Subordinates, for instance, who remain passive and who are inclined neither

to set goals nor to take the initiative in setting tasks, require initially an administrator who will set goals and tasks as well as the necessary support structure to insure that subordinates produce. Often, subordinates will signal the type of leadership they want or need. Through a process of training, working and interacting, the administrator then develops the subordinates' ability to propose goals and tasks and to carry them out willingly.

The Hersey-Blanchard Life Cycle Model, therefore, is in itself a model for personal leadership development. It supplies the mechanism and procedures for such development as well as the vocabulary and concepts for discussion and negotiation.

How is leadership effectiveness measured?

Leadership effectiveness is measured by staff output, i.e., accomplishment of goals, and staff morale. As suggested above, leadership effectiveness depends upon the administrator's proper diagnosis of subordinates' task relevant maturity and upon the administrator's flexibility in adopting the leadership style consistent with that diagnosis.

What are some of the common leadership problems with which administrators must deal?

In some situations, individuals known to have high task relevant maturity come together in a group which as a unit may exhibit low task relevant maturity. That is, together they cannot easily complete the task which is assigned them. The president and his cabinet in determining national policy are, at times, an example of this type of situation.

Another common problem lies in the relationship between administrator and subordinate. The problem surfaces during the interactions leading to the development of the subordinate's task relevant maturity. The ideal relationship lies in guiding the subordinate to upward movement, slowly and gradually, while the administrator does not let go of the task and continues to supply direction. The problem is simply that the balance is difficult to maintain.

What are common leadership problems encountered by directors of bilingual programs?

The choice of leadership style is a common problem. A bilingual director must decide what degree of structure subordinates require. Structure includes the type of direction given by an administrator, the tasks for which such direction is given, retention or delegation of responsibility, roles, goals, timelines and relationships behavior. A common problem is the difficulty for bilingual directors in providing their staff with structure and direction when they are needed.

What can be said in summary about good leadership?

One can say that the model for good leadership consists in the ability to diagnose the task relevant maturity of subordinates, and to implement the appropriate leadership style on the basis of such a diagnosis. The Life Cycle Model is a method which administrators can use in making such decisions. In addition to determining which leadership style to adopt, this model can also be used in determining how to deal with parent advisory councils and other groups and individuals.

Leadership Development:

Working Within a System

How a bilingual director must deal with a number of constituencies outside of his immediate program staff was the principal question posed by the participants of this Institute. Those constituencies are found among the administrators and personnel throughout the school district, as well as in the components which make up the surrounding community.

Specific questions in dealing with the school district were: how to deal with the school board, the superintendent, district-wide supervisors, building principals and the reality of "staff" versus "line" administrators. Dealing with the community gave rise to such questions as: how to deal with political leaders and organizations, negative attitudes toward the bilingual program, economic conflict issues and parent groups.

Strategies and information on how to deal with these phenomena are summarized by the following questions and answers.

Which school district personnel may a bilingual program director have to deal with?

- the school board
- the superintendent
- the superintendent's staff, such as directors of personnel, finances and curriculum
- district-wide supervisors of such areas as elementary and secondary curriculum, guidance, special education, pupil personnel and federal programs
- building principals
- non-bilingual program teaching staff and specialists

In dealing with such individuals, the bilingual director may also have to deal with negative attitudes toward bilingual education.

With what political realities and entities must the bilingual director cope?

The political entities usually encountered are the city or town council and the school board. Very often those bodies or members of them are negatively disposed toward bilingual education and advocate as rapid a linguistic and cultural assimilation as possible. At times such bodies or members of them reject the establishment of a bilingual program in their city, town or district altogether. State laws mandating bilingual education give both support and protection to bilingual programs.

What economic issues may a bilingual director have to deal with?

Declining enrollments and tight budgets are two outstanding issues at the present time. Various groups and individuals in the community are, therefore, increasingly concerned about where and how monies are spent on education. Another phenomenon is occurring in large urban areas, where the enrollment of ethnic minorities in schools is increasing, while the overall student enrollment is decreasing. This, of course, threatens the jobs of teachers educating the English-speaking population and makes employment opportunity more favorable for bilingual and ESL teachers. The result is that negative attitudes toward bilingual education are strengthened. Further, school committees, whether themselves negatively or positively disposed toward bilingual education, must themselves deal with such community pressures.

Bilingual programs funded with "soft" money, i.e., federal or other outside monies that are expected to cease after a certain period of time, create another problem. When such programs are to change over to "hard" money, i.e., local funding, a conservative reaction among school board members against the changeover and the bilingual program is often provoked. Typically, the bilingual program will be asked to justify and explain itself and a change in management style may be needed. Crucial at such a time is the superintendent's attitude toward the bilingual program.

What are some ways in which a bilingual director can deal with negative attitudes toward the bilingual program?

- Have program staff contact members of the community and the school board to urge them to support the bilingual program.

- Establish a working relationship with the school committee.

- Educate the community about bilingual education and the ethnic minorities that are part of it. To accomplish this, organize workshops or meetings in which an outside or third party is brought in to explain the various phenomena. Such a third party can be a member of the state department of education, one of the Title VII resource or dissemination centers, or the staff of a college or university involved in bilingual education. During such workshops, school board members and community groups can interact with the third party.

- Utilize bilingual program staff who are involved in community groups to create cultural awareness as a means of bringing about favorable attitudes and even support for bilingual education and the bilingual program. Civic, social, athletic, church and educational groups are possible vehicles for such activity.

- Utilize the parent advisory council. The latter can perform many important tasks, such as contacting the school board, articulating with the superintendent and other administrators, and engaging in activities to educate the community.

Where does the bilingual director usually stand in relation to other layers of administration within the school district and what implications for management does that standing have?

From an organizational point of view a school district typically will have a top layer of administration consisting of

superintendent, assistant superintendent, business manager, and personnel officer. On the same level or perhaps one or two levels down will be district-wide directors, supervisors or coordinators heading such areas as elementary and secondary education, special education, pupil personnel, bilingual education, physical education, music, foreign languages, library and audio-visual services. Directors of federal and state funded programs such as Title I, Title VII, and Title IV are also associated with this "middle ground," as well as building principals and assistant principals.

But the question is what is the authority and power that these individuals command? That power and authority is described when a given position (e.g. director of special education, principal) is classified as a "line" or as a "staff" position. The positions having "line" authority empower the individual to give direction and orders to subordinates. Often "line" positions carry the authority to hire and to dismiss as well as control over a budget. Superintendents and principals carry "line" authority.

"Staff" postions, on the other hand, usually deal with an aspect of curriculum and function as resources to other district personnel. "Staff" people may therefore assist and advise, but may not issue orders or directives. To make clear that a given position is a "staff" rather than a "line" position, the holder is often given the title of "coordinator" rather than director.

Heads of bilingual programs supported by "hard" money are most often appointed as "staff" rather than "line" administrators. It is, therefore, important for a bilingual coordinator to know from the outset the category to which he or she has been assigned. If appointed to a "staff" position, a bilingual coordinator will most likely be obliged to interface with one or more building principals.

Problems are bound to arise where a bilingual coordinator in a "staff" position is working with teachers who are subordinates to a building principal who has a "line" position. The problem is usually further complicated by the fact that a bilingual coordinator usually works with teachers in a number of school buildings, thus involving a number of building principals.

What problems arise where bilingual coordinators ("staff") function alongside building principals ("line")?

Where bilingual teachers are usually evaluated by the bilingual coordinator and the building principal, teachers are often confused by the resemblance of "staff" and "line" authority.

Where bilingual teachers answer to the bilingual coordinator and the building principal, and this is usually the case, teachers are put in the difficult position of having to report to two superiors who themselves may be in disagreement.

Accountability conflict is often the result of this dual authority. Since the building principal is a "line" administrator commanding resources, he or she can be held responsible for the achievement of bilingual program goals. At the same time, the bilingual coordinator, by virtue of his or her title, is also held accountable for goal achievement even though as a "staff" administrator he or she is responsible only for assistance to school staff and cannot issue orders or directives.

Owing dual allegiance often leads bilingual teachers to "play off" one superior against the other. For instance, a teacher may feel that he or she is part of the general teaching force and is, therefore, subject only to the principal. The bilingual coordinator, on the other hand, because he or she is accountable, may feel obligated to offer leadership.

How may such conflicts among bilingual coordinators, building principals and teachers be eliminated?

Do not establish the bilingual program as a separate entity. Make the program an integral part of the school system and let building principals be more responsible for the program's operation and effectiveness. For example, have the principal manage the program budget and be in charge of ordering bilingual curriculum materials.

Until the dual allegiance problem is solved, what techniques can be used to deal with conflicts?

- Form a principal's bilingual advisory council or a similar device to handle conflicts. On the council will be the building principal,

the bilingual coordinator, appropriate teaching personnel and specialists. When to introduce the teaching of English as a second language, what is to be the role of the parent advisory council and which bilingual textbooks are to be selected are possible areas of conflict that such a group can resolve.

- Have all program and non-program teachers who service bilingual students meet to share ideas and experiences, to discuss matters of curriculum and approach and to resolve problems and inconsistencies. Such meetings will provide a forum in which problems will be ironed out, all concerned can have input and participate in instructional decision-making and a "power balance" can be achieved informally.

Proposal Writing

The identified needs of specific bilingual populations were the impetus behind the questions and issues raised in the Institute on proposal writing. The main questions were how those populations and their needs could be better defined, how an appropriate and feasible educational program could be conceptualized and how that program could be translated into a fundable Title VII proposal consistent with federal guidelines.

Specific questions included how to perform a needs assessment, how to distinguish between supplanting and supplementing, how to obtain support services for bilingual programs, and how to elicit school board support for a bilingual program proposal.

To answer these questions, the presenters structured a two part Institute. The first part dealt simultaneously with the processes of conceptualizing a bilingual program and writing a fundable proposal. The second part dealt with ideas and suggestions, mostly in the form of checklists, intended to give assistance in initiating the proposal writing process and in evaluating both the process and its final product, i.e., the proposal.

Part I: Conceptualizing a Bilingual Program and Writing a Proposal

How, therefore, does one construct a good program or proposal and what are its major components?

One puts together a good program or proposal by doing the following things:

- identifying the educational needs of a target population through a needs assessment

  (N.B. One must take care in distinguishing between needs and the means whereby those needs are to be addressed as well as stating those needs in proper form. For example, to state "I need a community liaison worker" is not a good statement of need. Better statements are "Because there is little or no parent involvement in the bilingual program and in the

education of the students, there is need for a community liaison worker," or "Because there is no community liaison worker for the bilingual program, there is a serious lack of parental involvement in the bilingual program and in the education of the students.")

- deriving performance objectives from assessed needs, one objective per need
- designing procedures and activities, as well as identifying strategies and resources to achieve objectives
- preparing an effective evaluation design
- planning dissemination activities for what one has learned in the way of successful and unsuccessful practices

What, then, are the major components of a proposal for a program?

The major components are an abstract, program planning, program design, evaluation and dissemination.

What should one include in an abstract?

An abstract should be about one page in length with single spacing. It should consist of a title, a description of the community to be served, the target population for the program, the needs to be met, terminal or long term objectives, implementation procedures and activities, evaluation, techniques and procedures, and the project's contribution to education.

It is coverage of the above points that proposal readers usually seek in an abstract and that will stimulate interest.

What does the program planning component consist of?

The basic intention underlying the planning component is to determine where one is and where one wishes to be. The following items should be included under program planning.

- Description of the community to be served and the context in which the program will take place. This description is to contain physical and geographical information about the community, e.g., seacoast, industrial or rural town; history of the town or city; demographics including density and population size and any significant changes taking place; whether the population has language needs not addressed by the school system; what portion of the tax dollar is spent on education and on a per pupil basis; whether population shifts have put strain on the schools.

- Discussion of economic factors. This discussion should incorporate major industrial or economic changes affecting employment and income, the principal job and occupation sources, the existence of high unemployment and welfare, trends and plans for future development.

- Existing cultural and educational agencies and their relationship with the school department. Examples of such agencies are schools other than those in the district, museums, musical and artistic organizations. A lack of such institutions should be noted as well as the possibilities of cooperation. Such cooperation could consist of involvement of such agencies in the planning and proposal writing phases of the bilingual programs and in a sharing of resources. An example of sharing would be to have teacher trainees in a local college work with gifted children.

- Description of the school system. That description should contain the number of schools, enrollment, organization (elementary, middle, secondary levels, etc.), financial status, per pupil costs, tax efforts to support the schools.

- Enumeration of the possibilities that the appropriate bilingual program will open up for the community in view of its economic and educational needs.

- Participation of the non-public schools in the bilingual program. This participation is required because the parents of students in private schools are also tax payers. The bilingual program must

provide for all participating non-public schools the same services as are provided for the public schools. However, to be eligible, the non-public schools must establish a true bilingual program of their own. To provide such services to non-public schools without their having met this requirement would be to supplant rather than supplement under Title VII regulations. Non-public schools are not obliged to participate in a bilingual grant or proposal, however, one must document cases in which they refrain.

- Review of research. Such a review will aid proposal writers and eventual beneficiaries (i.e. students) of the program by providing a sound basis for program development in both theory and practice. Further, it will show the proposal reader that the writers are aware of what is occurring in the field. The review should be brief and limited to recent studies and should include visitations to other similar programs. Quotations and descriptions are appropriate as well as mention of assistance sought from agencies such as the state department of education, research and consultation firms. The review should be supportive of the program.

- Description of needs assessment and learner needs. The purpose of the needs assessment is to determine the point at which one's target population and program efforts are in order to plan the series of steps leading to the point where one wishes them to be. One must describe institutional needs, i.e., the resources the school district will and will not provide, and learner needs, students who fall below a predetermined standard of expectation, as well as the relationship between the two sets of needs.

  All needs should be prioritized. A description of how they were assessed should include the instruments and techniques used, the data collection method, evidence of the reliability and validity of the data, and the criteria used to identify students having needs. Common assessment techniques are tests, including standardized tests, surveys, drop-out and other statistics. Survey questionnaires and letters of support may be used

to identify institutional and community needs. An advisory board can also be used to document and evaluate needs and school district goals. Such a board could include individuals from industry. Prioritizing needs can be used as a device to limit the eventual program to what it can handle.

- Description of the proposal writing team. The team should contain no more than seven persons and should represent the relevant constituencies in the school district, such as community members, parents, elementary and secondary staff. Recruitment should be done by means of a definite set of criteria including writing ability and knowledge of the field. School administrators should be asked to release school staff who have been selected to serve on the team. The team approach will give all the constituencies involved a sense of ownership in the program and in the proposal.

What does the program design consist of?

The formulation and statement of program objectives comprise the first part of program design. Such objectives must be related to the list of prioritized needs mentioned above. Program objectives will be of two types: immediate or current-year objectives and terminal objectives. Terminal objectives are usually few in number. Objectives must not be merely a definition of curriculum (i.e., what is to be taught), but rather statements of what the students will be able to do at the end of the program or some segment of it.

Objectives are to be written for program components and participants including students, teachers, parents and administrators. The objectives should describe the target population (i.e., who is to be changed), the task or outcome to be achieved, the way in which or the circumstances under which the outcomes will be achieved, in what period of time, as well as with what instruments and by what standards, those outcomes will be evaluated.

Objectives must be written to cover the entire length of the program. Therefore, for all those to be affected by the program (students, teachers, administrators, parents) the program must be divided into smaller time segments. For given time

segments, cognitive objectives may, for example, indicate that students will increase in a specific skill by completing a specific project or that teachers will cooperate in developing criteria for evaluating certain projects. Objectives in the affective area may indicate changes in attitudes or awareness as manifested in certain types of behaviors. For example, teachers may manifest increased awareness of a particular value or phenomenon by doing voluntary coursework, by volunteering to work with parents or students, or by identifying resources. Objectives focusing on in-service training may stipulate that teachers identify, plan or communicate a given curriculum for a given target population.

If "sensitivity" workshops for non-bilingual staff are planned, it is well to let them be voluntary. An incentive to recruit participants is to offer in-service credit through a college or university. Interest may be further stimulated by having potential participants complete a needs assessment questionnaire and structuring the course to meet the needs identified. One should ask what potential participants would like to see and do in the course and how willing they are to participate. Many colleges will be glad to furnish guidelines to organize such courses.

A second segment of program design deals with the procedures and activities prescribed for achievement of objectives.

Care must be taken, above all, that the program activities be well related to the objectives and needs assessed and that a set of relevant activities be outlined for each program component. The program of activities should, in effect, describe a set of processes designed to bring about the achievement of stated objectives. That process description should include an identification of related personnel, materials and facilities. In the description of facilities one should point out their location and give evidence of their suitability. Further, all activities should be located in a time frame. Organizational charts or activity matrices are recommended to illustrate the relationship of all these elements.

The program's budget is a third item under program design. As a first step, it is advisable to obtain an idea of how much money is available from the funding source and how much funding can be reasonably requested. A school district's financial officer will usually provide such information. A team can then examine the proposed program and all its components to estimate costs. A budget must, in effect, present a financial plan, prepared in sufficient detail and indicating costs which can, if necessary, be defended.

The program's evaluation scheme is the fourth element in program design. The underlying purpose of program evaluation is to determine whether the program has been effective, or, to what extent the program accomplished its objectives. An important feature of an evaluation design, closely associated with this fundamental purpose, is the utility of evaluative information for decision-making purposes. Such information commonly comes in the form of recommendations for improvement in program practice. When such information and recommendations are provided on an on-going basis, that is, where evaluation focuses upon the effectiveness of prescribed activities in the course of program operation, one is dealing in formative evaluation. Summative or product evaluation in its strictest sense is provided at the program's termination and judges the degree to which the program has, in the final analysis, achieved its objectives. It is important that the evaluation design provide for both formative and summative evaluation.

The evaluation design must likewise provide a schedule for the collection of the relevant data upon which the evaluation is to be made. That schedule may include such things as tests, other instruments and techniques such as questionnaires and interviews, and, where large populations are concerned, a sampling procedure. Provision must also be made for the analysis and reporting of data and conclusions.

Dissemination is the fifth element under program design. Dissemination usually seeks to make available to the public and the community what the program has learned in the way of successful and unsuccessful practices. It may also provide for making available products developed, such as instructional materials. Dissemination may assume many forms, for instance, "open house," hand-outs, newspaper articles, publication of handbooks and instructional materials.

Part II: Ideas and Questions

What elements should a proposal for a bilingual program contain?

A proposal should contain, first of all, a needs assessment, i.e., the part which answers the question "What's the problem?" The needs assessment should be the only negative part of the proposal. The positive parts are: goals, participants, procedures, staff, supplies and equipment, facilities, timelines, and a budget.

What are some simple areas in which proposal writers make mistakes?

These are deadlines (usually specified in federal regulations), the number of copies required at the time of proposal submission, and errors in budgeting.

How do proposal writers get ideas for innovative proposals?

One technique is to brainstorm. Another is to have individuals write down ideas, report them orally and rank order the ideas. A third technique is to take a sheet of paper, state on top a problem (i.e. need), and divide the page into two columns. The first time the paper is sent around, individuals will write in solutions to the problem in the left hand column. When the column is full, the paper is sent around a second time, when individuals write, in the right hand column, comments on the ideas in the left hand column.

What are questions that should be asked when conceptualizing a bilingual program?

What are the district's needs?

Whom will the project serve?

How will the project continue when outside funding ceases? What does the research say about continuance (i.e., capacity building)?

What features will make the project innovative and unique?

Which program features seem promising?

Is outside help needed? Whom can one speak to?

How does one recruit or contact staff to obtain input?

How does one involve other educational and cultural agencies?

How does one keep the school administration informed?

What are some reasonable "bail park" figures for a budget?

What other factors should be kept in mind when writing a proposal?

- In asking for money, act as a broker.
- In asking for money, show confidence.
- To foster organizational credibility, show the competencies and skills you have.
- To foster project credibility, include with the proposal staff resumés and written endorsements.
- Read and reread federal guidelines.
- Share the tasks of proposal writing.
- Reach out for community participation.
- Recognize school board members by asking them to comment on a draft copy of the proposal.
- Be sensitive to priorities.
- Do a thorough needs assessment.
- Research the topic well.
- Seek expert advice when you need it.
- Be your own proposal manager.
- Build the program into the school district; do not make it separate and detached.
- Secure top-to-bottom support for the proposal.
- Set a schedule and meet deadlines.
- Assign tasks to people who can do them.
- Seek advice from federal and state agencies.
- Eliminate jargon and avoid emotional appeal.

- Submit a project you can manage — do not try to do too much.
- Have confidence.

How can a proposal be made more readable?

- Market your idea.
- Be serious but not dull.
- Let persuasive arguments show the reader the benefit of your product.
- Put your proposal in a format that is "skimmable."
- Use as few writers as possible.
- Visualize your funding source as one person.
- Write in the third person.
- Select an informative and interesting title.
- Use a table of contents, number the pages and use dividers.
- Underline key words.
- Reinforce words and narrative by means of illustrations, charts and maps.
- Keep sentences and paragraphs short.
- Use "bullet" lists where appropriate.
- Use quick newspaper-like openers or highlighters.
- Begin the proposal with the most important points.
- Be positive by emphasizing opportunity rather than need.
- Demonstrate confidence — avoid "we hope" and say "we will."

- Don't overdo any point.
- Be organized.
- Keep all things short and simple.
- Let the narrative be brief.
- In writing a continuation grant, be sure to include improvements and innovations.
- Do not fill appendices with irrelevant matter.
- Be concrete rather than philosophical.
- Have others read the proposal to check flow and accuracy.

Are there any other items to be checked in a proposal? Yes.

- Make sure that parents are involved.
- Make sure that the program staff will be bilingual and if not, why not.
- Check that there is no supplanting.
- Check the proposal for cost-effectiveness.
- Rate your own proposal according to the point system to be used by readers.
- Hire the evaluator when writing your proposal so that the evaluator can help formulate goals and objectives.
- Use language screening tests to identify the target population where appropriate.
- Justify your choice of screening instruments.
- In the appendices, include forms, letters of endorsement and questionnaires.
- Specify your entry/exit criteria.
- Provide in the budget for any products to come out of the project.

What sorts of questions do proposal readers ask when rating proposals?

Does the project fit into our priorities?

Will it have the kind of impact we want?

Are the time, money and personnel estimates realistic?

Are the evaluation criteria sound?

Can and will the organization support the project beyond the grant period?

Are the needs real and in need of solution? Is this well-documented in the proposal?

Is there local involvement in the project?

Has there been expert input into the project?

Does the organization have credibility?

Does the project provide for participation of children enrolled in non-profit private schools?

How will project participants be identified?

Parental Involvement

Ideas and strategies for the creative and productive involvement of parents in the bilingual program were the main interest of participants in this Institute. The discussion also included a consideration of the role that parents can and should have and of their role as defined by federal and state regulations for parent advisory councils.

How to relate with bilingual parents, how to obtain their cooperation and participation in the parent advisory council, how to assess their needs and how to train them in performing their roles were among the questions raised during the Institute.

In what sorts of ways should the Parent Advisory Council be involved in a local bilingual program?

Fundamentally, the parent advisory council (PAC) should:

- be supportive of the bilingual program and be allowed to offer its advice and recommendations to program administrators and staff as well as to the school district
- be allowed to have input into certain decisions regarding the bilingual program, e.g., the formulation of a program philosophy and curriculum
- train its members in how to function in the socio-political context in which the bilingual program finds itself and in how to involve themselves effectively in the bilingual program

What are some basic points that parents should be made aware of in PAC training sessions?

Parents should be brought to understand the issue of ethnicity in the United States, the role of the bilingual program in the education of their children, different philosophies of bilingual education such as maintenance and transitional and the value system they have encountered in the United States.

How does one begin to relate with bilingual parents?

One begins by getting to know the parents and their needs. The following questions will help PAC staff in assessing parent needs:

Do both parents work a full day?

Where do the parents come from?

How much education do they have?

Do they participate in the community through church related activities?

Do they attend general school activities or do they tend to participate only when their own language and culture are involved?

Are they citizens? If not, do they want or intend to become citizens?

Do they have any knowledge of English? Are they literate in their native language?

What values do they consider most important?

How do their values differ from the values they find in the United States?

Are they concerned about education and the education of their children?

What are some of the concerns that bilingual parents have about the bilingual program?

Parent concerns include the following:

- the language teaching policy of the school system
- the progress and school achievement of their children and what it means
- the attitude toward and the support for their involvement in decision-making on the part of the school or school system
- sensitivity toward their culture and toward what their culture is about
- transportation and busing of school children
- racial and ethnic issues
- special needs that their children may have

What kinds of strategies can be used to relate with bilingual parents and to enlist their involvement in the PAC and the bilingual program?

Among the strategies suggested were:

- providing information and support to non English-speaking parents in the areas of housing and welfare
- helping parents to identify and contact community agencies
- sensitizing the English-speaking community and creating trust between parents and school administrators
- disseminating information through single issue newsletters (writing style should be simple, in big letters and artistically inclined parents can be employed to work on publications)

- announcing PAC meetings on foreign language TV, on radio and on public stations
- obtaining parent input into proposals
- encouraging contact and mutual support among parents and program teachers
- instructing parents of the rights and privileges granted them by state and federal laws and regulations
- arranging meetings between the "master" PAC and the superintendent
- acquainting parents with the school committee and personnel in the superintendent's office
- advising parents of federal and state agencies which can give them information and support and of professional services to which they can refer
- training parents to work with bilingual program administrators as advocates for parent input

What kinds of strategies can be used to minimize and eliminate confrontations between PAC's and school districts?

- allow parents to have input into the hiring of bilingual program personnel
- use community agencies, teachers and administrators to assist and support parents in communicating with the school committee
- keep parents informed through dissemination of materials and PAC guides
- sensitize parents to the types of instruction given in the English-speaking and bilingual classrooms
- encourage parents to support both types of instruction and to assist their children

- obtain the active support of community agencies in promoting attendance at PAC meetings
- let parents assume the responsibilities of planning, conducting, announcing and recruiting for PAC meetings
- encourage parents whose children have completed the bilingual program to remain active in PAC and school activities
- require bilingual directors to attend PAC meetings

Strategies for Involving Bilingual and Monolingual Students in Joint Activities

Infrequent contact among bilingual and mainstream program students in a school district can have harmful effects. It can result in mutual distrust and hostility, can hinder the acculturation process and deprive English-speaking students of the opportunity to appreciate and learn about other cultural groups in their midst. Further, infrequent contact deprives both groups of the opportunity to learn the language of the other. Finally, all these potential problems bear upon the wider issue of the relationship between the non-English and English-speaking communities.

It was with the aim of preventing such problems and opening up to all concerned the advantages of on-going communication that participants of the third Institute for Program Improvement sat down to compile a repertoire of strategies that they could draw upon. That repertoire or list is as follows:

- integrate and involve bilingual administrators in top-level decision-making to facilitate the development of parallel curriculum and the integration of bilingual students in the English-speaking program
- integrate and involve the bilingual teaching faculty with that of the mainstream program
- facilitate student interaction by grade level through class assignment and physical location of classes
- allow bilingual program teachers to assist bilingual students in the process of selecting courses
- provide tutoring services by pairing bilingual and mainstream students where appropriate
- use honor students to tutor bilingual students as part of their community service requirement and vice-versa

- reserve slots, based on some equitable formula, for bilingual representation in student government
- encourage participation in sports; provide basic sports skills clinics in which English-speaking students instruct bilingual students and vice-versa
- provide native and local history courses in the mainstream curriculum; involve bilingual teachers in joint teaching responsibilities for particular units
- hold joint media presentations allowing students to share information
- provide joint field trip opportunities
- provide appropriate foreign language instruction to bilingual and English-speaking students
- encourage students to participate in joint extracurricular activities
- allow bilingual students to receive credit for working with community agencies
- offer credit to students who help other students

Curricular Strategies

Institute participants pointed out a number of problems in the area of bilingual program curriculum.

The source of those problems is the newness and complexity of the bilingual field and the relation of the bilingual program curriculum to that of the school district. Lack of coordination between school district and bilingual program in matters of curriculum was identified as a particularly acute problem area.

Institute participants suggested the following strategies whereby the district and the bilingual program can work together in formulating a parallel curriculum.

- Look at curriculum in an interdisciplinary context, e.g., language skills as related to social studies; native language study as related to ESL and district English language courses.
- Set up an interdepartmental curriculum committee, including bilingual program staff, to coordinate and reinforce curriculum development efforts.
- Consider models of effective teaching, e.g., use of native language to present and expand an ESL concept.
- To get started, have a committee of parents, administrators, community members and teachers review the bilingual program through visits and interviews.
- To insure development of parallel curriculum, have ESL, bilingual and classroom teachers plan courses together.
- Foster an attitude of "ownership" on the part of all district staff for bilingual program students, i.e., the education of the bilingual students is the mission of all in the district, not just of the bilingual program staff.

- Where possible, establish ESL programs for bilingual parents and develop their ability to have a role in curriculum development.
- Provide for quality control of the bilingual program, consistency of teaching techniques, and adoption of a philosophy of bilingual education.
- Obtain samples of curriculum that has been successful in other school districts.
- Develop literature courses at the high school level in the students' native language as well as in English.
- Through the study of language and literature, develop in students a sensitivity for the depth of human experience contained in their own and in American culture.
- Develop for the English-speaking students courses related to the culture and civilization of the bilingual students in their district, e.g., courses in Caribbean history.

Assessment

The question of assessment in bilingual programs is complex and controversial. Participants were particularly concerned about the problems they have had in implementing the requirements of the LAU vs. Nichols Decision and the LAU Remedies for school districts having non-English or limited English-speaking students.

Among the issues cited were problems with procedures required by the Office of Civil Rights such as identification and registration of LEP students, when to test for language dominance and proficiency, which tests to use, the lack of qualified test administrators, and the lack of consistency in OCR policies in dealing with different school districts.

The view of bilingual education as a deficit model rather than a positive alternative, a tendency to label students on the basis of test results and to stress student weaknesses over strengths were other assessment related problems mentioned.

When it was suggested that bilingual staff work together with district-wide staff in developing and implementing LAU compliance plans, it was pointed out that animosities due to economic factors among bilingual and other district staff were a deterrent. Such animosities exist where increasing enrollments of bilingual students occur in districts having otherwise decreasing enrollments, as pointed out in the Institute on Leadership Development: Working within a System.

To deal with such assessment related problems, participants offered the following strategies.

- Have bilingual and district staff work together in developing entrance/exit procedures for bilingual program students.
- Establish sensitivity training sessions for non-bilingual staff.
- Provide for contact and interaction among bilingual and district-wide staff.
- Set up a central diagnostic service center to deal with the placement of all types of students in a district, including bilingual students.